



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,307	08/03/2006	Isao Hirose	062662	6879
38834	7590	09/30/2008		
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			EXAMINER	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW			NEILS, PEGGY A	
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			2885	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/588,307	HIROSE, ISAO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PEGGY A. NEILS	2885	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/3/2006</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings were received on August 3, 2006. These drawings are approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Kittelmann et al.

Kittelmann et al shows an illumination device with an elliptical reflector 1 and a cylindrical light source 2. As shown in Figure 2, an embodiment is shown with the light source positioned between the first and second focal points of the reflector.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reis.

Reiss shows an illumination system which includes a parabolic reflector 22 and a light source 11. As discussed in the disclosure beginning at line 31, the light source may be positioned between the base of the reflector and the focal point of the parabola.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kittelmann et al in view of Mi et al.

Kittelmann et al shows a lighting system but does not limit its use to a particular environment. Mi et al teaches that it is known in the art to use a lighting device as a photoreactive device in a manufacturer process. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the lighting device of Kittelmann et al could be used in a manufacturing process in the same manner as taught by Mi et al because the concentrated illumination shown by Kittelmann et al would be ideal for an exposure system such Mi et al.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiss in view of Mi et al.

Reiss shows a lighting system and suggests that it is be useful as a headlight. Mi et al teaches that it is known in the art to use a lighting device as a photoreactive device in a

manufacturer process. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the lighting device of Kittelmann et al could be used in a manufacturing process in the same manner as taught by Mi et al because the concentrated beam shown by Reiss would be ideal for an exposure system such Mi et al.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kittelmann et al.

Claims 2 and 3 set forth dimensions for the dimensions for the lighting device. Kittelmann et al does not limit the structure to any particular size. In the absence of any unobvious or unexpected results the relationship between the light source and reflector is considered a design choice depending on the operating conditions for the lighting device.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiss.

Claims 5 and 6 set forth dimensions for the lighting device. Reiss does not limit the structure to any particular size. In the absence of any unobvious or unexpected results the dimensional relationship between the light source and reflector is considered a design choice depending on the operating conditions for the lighting device.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hough et al, Dieffenbach et al and Wilkens are cited of interest.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be

Application/Control Number: 10/588,307
Art Unit: 2885

Page 5

directed to Examiner Neils at (571) 272-2377 on a Monday, Tuesday or Thursday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jong (James) Lee can be reached on (571) 272-7044.

PAN

/Stephen F. Husar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2875